

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 12 remain in this application. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. US 7,058,409 B2 to Hänninen, et al. ("Hanninen") in view of U.S. Patent No. US 6,993,354 B2 to Momosaki, et al. ("Momosaki").

Claim 1 provides, *inter alia*, coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with one or more remote devices "by associating the collected data with the incident".

The above Advisory Action asserts the claim 1 provides "at least one video sensor of at least one remote device" and, thus, claim 1 does not require multiple sources of data. Applicants respectfully asserts that the Examiner may have missed certain key words in the claim 1, namely "coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device *with* the at least one remote device". The wireless communication device is not coordinating data collection of the remote device, but is coordinating data collection "with" the remote device. Thus, data is collected from the wireless communication device as well as the at least one remote device.

The above Advisory Action also states that it is unreasonable to assume that Hanninen's teaching infers only one single victim (i.e., single data source) in a single crime, even though Hanninen explicitly teaches only one single victim using the personal safety net system of Hanninen. It would have been obvious, and possible, to have a single crime involving multiple victims each using the personal safety net system.

Applicants concede that, in accordance with Hanninen, it is possible to have two different victims involved in two different crimes, in which each victim uses the personal safety net system. Applicants do not agree that it would have been obvious to have two different victims involved in a single crime, in which each victim uses the personal safety net system. If the Examiner would like to continue to assert this argument, then Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner produce a reference that supports this inference of obviousness.

Even if Hanninen were to describe multiple victims using the personal safety net system as being involved in a single crime, claim 1 still distinguishes from Hanninen. Since, as the Examiner as conceded above, Hanninen does not explicitly teach only one single victim using the personal safety net system, Hanninen does not describe or suggest *coordinating* collection of data of multiple devices, as require by claim 1. In fact, Hanninen does not even recognize the need for coordinating data collection among multiple devices.

Likewise, Momosaki does not describe or suggest any type of coordination of data collection between devices. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes patentably from Hanninen, Momosaki, and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 6 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 through 6 distinguish patentably from Hanninen, Momosaki, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 1.

Claim 7 as amended provides, *inter alia*, recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote mobile device.

The above Advisory Action states that Hanninen teaches an emergency mode of the personal safety net system in response to a panic button on the mobile terminal 120 by the victim. However, the panic button is located on the local device, not on a remote device. Thus, the signal would be internal to the local device and would not be received from any remote device, as required by claim 7.

The above Advisory Action also states that Hanninen teaches that, during an emergency mode, an interactive control program allows police to control the operations of the mobile terminal and to control the camera operation of the external camera via mobile terminal 120. The above Advisory Action further states that Hanninen teaches the recording activation of the external camera 110 is effected by the police.

Hanninen does not describe or suggest recording data in response to detecting a request signal or receiving information about a designated location from the remote *mobile* device, as required by claim 7. As the Advisory Action states, Hanninen describes remote operation of a

camera by an emergency service operator or a predetermined authority, such as the police, but Hanninen does not describe or suggest remote camera operation by an emergency service operator or a predetermined authority using a *remote mobile device*. The above Advisory Action asserts that camera control via a mobile terminal is disclosed at col. 4, lines 50 through 56, of Hanninen, but Applicants find no description or suggestion at this part, or any other part, of Hanninen.

Likewise, Momosaki does not describe or suggest any type of data recordation in response to a signal or information received from a remote device. Therefore, claim 7 distinguishes patentably from Hanninen, Momosaki, and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 8 through 12 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 7. Therefore, claims 8 through 12 distinguish patentably from Hanninen, Momosaki, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 7.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 12 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brown, Daniel P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>04/18/2007</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	